



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/763,104

01/22/2004

Jannis G. Stavrianopoulos

Enz-61(D4)

7444

28171 7590 02/01/2011
ENZO BIOCHEM, INC.
527 MADISON AVENUE (9TH FLOOR)
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

RILEY, JEZIA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1637

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/01/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/763,104	Applicant(s) STAVRIANOPOULOS ET AL.	
	Examiner Jezia Riley	Art Unit 1637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 287-320 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 287-299, 303-312 and 315-317 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 300-302, 313, 314 and 318-320 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/10/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 287, 288, 291-294, 297, 298, 303-308, 310-312, 315, 316 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4-11, and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 7,256,291. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are both claiming a labeled target and labeling reagent comprising a marker moiety linked to a reactive group via a linker for attaching the labeling reagent to a target. Said linker can comprise a backbone comprising at least 2 consecutive peptide bonds.

3. Claims 287-294, 297, 298, 303, 305-308, 310-312, 315, 316 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 7,166,478. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are both claiming a labeled target and labeling reagent comprising a marker moiety linked to a reactive group via a linker for attaching the labeling reagent to a target. Said linker can comprise a backbone comprising at least 2 consecutive peptide bonds.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 287-291, 297-299 303, 305-308, 315-317 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thiele et al. (Analytical Biochemistry 218, 330-337 (1994)).

Thiele et al. discloses photocleavable biotinylated ligands. In page 333, it is shown a labeling reagent for labeling target. Said labeling reagent comprising a moiety, biotin, attached to a reactive group by a linker arms comprising peptide bonds (CO-NH). And said reactive group is capable of forming a C-C linkage with the target. (see scheme I).

Claims 289 are also included in the rejection because their limitations do not further limit claim 287 to said nucleic acid being the target.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 287-299, 303, 305-312, 315-317 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thiele et al. (Analytical Biochemistry 218, 330-337 (1994)) in view of Rothschild et al. (US6,589,736).

Thiele et al. discloses photocleavable biotinylated ligands. In page 333, it is shown a labeling reagent for labeling target. Said labeling reagent comprising a moiety, biotin, attached to a reactive group by a linker arms comprising peptide bonds (CO-NH). And said reactive group is capable of forming a C-C linkage with the target. (see scheme I).

Rothschild et al. disclosed photocleavable agents for the detection and isolation of biomolecules. In the Summary of the invention, it is shown that the bioreactive agent is composed of marker (D) linked to reactive group (aromatic ring which can be covalently attached to a biomolecule (peptides, nucleic acid etc.)).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to apply the agent of Rothschild comprising a detectable moiety being a fluorescent label ((col. 9, line 45-47) for the agent of Thiele. The motivation is that fluorescent label are well known and widely used as a detectable label in molecular biology.

8. Claims 300-302, 313, 314, 318-320 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jezia Riley whose telephone number is 571-272-0786. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jezia Riley/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1637
1/29/2011